

Message

---

**From:** McInerney, Lucy (ECY) [LPEB461@ECY.WA.GOV]  
**Sent:** 6/7/2019 5:39:44 PM  
**To:** Cerise, Kathy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=3ccf3f66d09943fe914be271fc992084-Hernandez, Kathryn]  
**Subject:** RE: cPAH's risk-based values//FW: Quendall Proposed Plans

Hi Kathy, per my voice-mail, I'm now the designated Quendall contact for Ecology Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) I've also taken over project management of Ching-Pi's Gas Works Park and Barbee Mill MTCA sites.

Since I'm new to the Quendall project, would it be possible for EPA to provide the status of the Operable Unit 2 Proposed Plan, and a brief overview of the evolution of PRGs for cPAHs in sediment since the December 18 Proposed Plan for Public Comment document? Providing this context at the beginning of our June 19 meeting would be very helpful.

Also, please confirm who will attend the meeting for EPA. For Ecology it will be Priscilla Tomlinson, Chance Asher and myself.

Thank you. I look forward to meeting you on June 19.

Lucy

**Lucille T. McInerney, P.E.** | Cleanup Project Manager  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
Northwest Regional Office | Toxics Cleanup Program  
3190 160th Avenue SE, Bellevue, WA 98008-5452  
425-649-7272 | [lucy.mcinerney@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:lucy.mcinerney@ecy.wa.gov)



---

**From:** Wang, Ching-Pi (ECY) <CWAN461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 16, 2019 10:54 AM  
**To:** Cerise, Kathy <Cerise.Kathryn@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Tomlinson, Priscilla (ECY) <PTOM461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Asher, Chance (ECY) <CASH461@ECY.WA.GOV>; McInerney, Lucy (ECY) <LPEB461@ECY.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** cPAH's risk-based values//FW: Quendall Proposed Plans

Dear Kathy:

First my apologies for a 6-weeks delayed response to your email below.

Ecology would like to meet with you and Lon Kissinger, and any other EPA colleagues, to discuss ramifications of establishing cPAH risk-based values.

We would like to share our concerns regarding values based on early life exposure using child fish consumption rates. For example, topics we would need to discuss are:

- 1) Incorporating early life exposure for the fish consumption exposure pathway per EPA policy.
- 2) Use of a subsistence fisher consumption rate (e.g., tribal) per EPA policy.
- 3) Ramifications to establishing different cPAH cleanup levels for GasWorks Park, Quendall Terminals, and the Lake Washington and Lake Union.

These topics are very important to Ecology and we want to share our point of view.

An in-person meeting is preferred over a telephone conference call. We would be happy to come to your office in Seattle.

Please provide dates and times for a 2-hour meeting at your convenience. We will accommodate accordingly.

Sincerely,

Ching-Pi  
425.649.7134.

---

**From:** Cerise, Kathy [<mailto:Cerise.Kathryn@epa.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 29, 2019 1:00 PM

**To:** Wang, Ching-Pi (ECY) <[CWAN461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:CWAN461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Cc:** [rwar462@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:rwar462@ECY.WA.GOV); Blocker, Shawn <[Blocker.Shawn@epa.gov](mailto:Blocker.Shawn@epa.gov)>; Grandinetti, Cami <[Grandinetti.Cami@epa.gov](mailto:Grandinetti.Cami@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Quendall Proposed Plans

Ching-Pi,

Regarding the PRG of 1.62 mg/kg for subsistence fish/shellfish consumer and incorporation of early life exposure assumptions: For fish/shellfish consumption, the subsistence consumer scenario did not include early life exposures for cPAHs (consistent with the RI). The inclusion of early life exposures for cPAHs requires reliable knowledge of child consumption rates for fish/shellfish, which are not available.

Regarding the question on use of 2007 Tribal Framework: EPA consulted with the Muckleshoots regarding use of the Tulalip consumption rate during the RI phase and was asked **not** to use it. We have provided the current Proposed Plan to the Muckleshoot and received no comments; if in the future the Muckleshoot Tribe decides that a proxy is necessary, EPA would strongly consider a ROD amendment or ESD to satisfy our Tribal Trust responsibilities.

Regarding the PRG of 0.98 mg/kg for beach user and incorporation of early life exposure assumptions: Early life exposures for cPAHs were included into the risk/PRG estimates, incorporating the child and adult exposure assumptions, consistent with the RI (Table 7.1-5 of the 2012 Final RI Report). We did compare our number to Ecology's existing number to demonstrate it was in the ballpark.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Kathryn Cerise  
UCR RPM